

377 Jan Smuts Avenue: correspondence summary

Erf 540 Craighall Park | City reference: AS 20-01-7004
CraigPark Residents' Association (CRA)

Correspondence and response status

On 15 October 2026, CRA chairperson Albert De Bondt wrote to the applicant's town planner, Mario Di Cicco, requesting a point-by-point response and supporting documents by 17:00 SAST on 22 October 2026. CRA sent a reminder on the morning of 22 October.

CRA reports that no response to these questions was received by the requested deadline. The supplied email chain contains CRA's request and reminder, but no reply from the town planner. The five areas below therefore remained unanswered at that deadline.

1. Relationship between the two applications

CRA asked for confirmation that Erf 540 at 377 Jan Smuts Avenue and Erf 542 at 375 Jan Smuts Avenue are separate but related applications, with eventual consolidation intended. It requested the status of the earlier application, the consolidation timetable and a plan showing both properties, proposed uses and any shared access, parking, loading or storage.

2. Existing activities and proposed changes

CRA asked which activities currently operate on the property, what approvals they have, which additional rights are sought, and the basis for the statement that no additional traffic is anticipated. It sought a clear distinction between the showroom, office and hardware uses and the motor repair, ancillary panelbeating and builders-yard activities.

3. Parking and inconsistencies in the documents

CRA requested an explanation of the plan's figures of 47 parking bays required and 25 provided, together with a calculation for the uses actually proposed. It also asked for conflicting 375/377 address labels, existing and new floor areas, development controls and the "Hotel H1" classification to be reconciled. The parking figures were raised for clarification, not as a verified final shortfall.

4. Protection of neighbours and pedestrians

CRA asked how the proposed uses fit the site and what enforceable conditions would control their scale, operating hours, noise, dust, fumes, storage, waste, fire safety and deliveries. It also requested details of pedestrian safety improvements along the frontage.

5. Corrected information and opportunity to respond

CRA requested a clear, corrected set of documents and confirmation of how these would be shared with the City and those who had commented, with an appropriate opportunity to respond. If information was still being prepared, CRA asked when it would be available.

CRA's stated next step

CRA said it would proceed on the information available and record the unanswered questions if no substantive response was received. It remained open to constructive engagement before the advertised objection deadline of 5 November 2026.

Source: CRA emails dated 15 and 22 October 2026, and CRA's supplied statement on the response status. This is a summary of the correspondence, not a finding that the potential impacts described are occurring.